

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19227

Here are a few comments typical of those opposing the wheat sale:

Farmer from Greene County:
Just helping Russia to bury us at our expense.

Farmer from Sangamon County:
One year ago this country was alerted to the prospects of a third world war, avoided by promises to get soldiers out of Cuba, missiles, etc. No proof by inspection as pledged. Why do we reward the unfaithful?

Farmer from Calhoun County:
When you have a club, don't give it to your enemy and expect him not to use it.

Farmer from Cass County:
Let's wipe out hunger in the free countries first.

Farmer from Hancock County:
I do not have a bit of confidence in anything they do or say, and I wouldn't trust them any further than I could throw a ton bull by the tail.

Farmer from Greene County:
How does it happen that Freeman did not know of a shortage of wheat when he was in Russia? Is it possible Russia is storing food to carry through some crises?

Farmer from Morgan County:
Not the \$43 a bushel corn.

Farmer from Sangamon County:
I do not believe we should deal with a bunch of crooks and murderers of Khrushchev or any of the satellite countries. I think we will lose if we do.

Farmer from Cass County:
I do not approve, but I feel that I am in the minority because the majority will put the dollar ahead of principle.

Farmer from Jersey County:
This goes for Tito, too.

Farmer from Macoupin County:
Remember the scrap iron we sold Japan.

Farmer from Morgan County:
The New Frontier is taking us back to where Roosevelt took us and left us. If I gave you my honest opinion this paper would be scorched.

Farmer from Adams County:
Farm votes should not be for sale.

Farmer from Brown County:
This is one of the most stupid decisions the present administration has made yet. Why (many whys) should we be cooperative with our most dangerous enemy? Why should we?

Farm wife from Sangamon County:
I am a farmer's wife and to h— with Russia. They don't care if their own people starve.

Farmer from Jersey County:
Why feed our worst enemy?

Here are comments typical of those who said yes to the wheat sale but added their own stipulations:

Farmer from Brown County:

But let's have those troops removed from Cuba in the deal.

Farmer from Schuyler County:

I do think it would have been a good time to insist that Russia withdraw from Cuba.

Farmer from Jersey County:

Provided we get a full cash payment on delivery and provided Russian troops are withdrawn from Cuba.

Farmer from Jersey County:

It is a mystery to me as to why the United States is selling wheat to Russia and Russia is not paying the United States for past debts.

Farmer from McDonough County:

They just as well sell them wheat. They turned Cuba over to them. Broke the Monroe Doctrine without a struggle.

Farmer from Schuyler County:

If [it] would get rid of some surplus on a cash basis paid in gold at our port, and they agreed to get out of Cuba and stay out. I think we should get some settlement on Germany. And do they need wheat or are they trying to trick us? We should have market price at our port.

Farmer from Greene County:

We had just as well sell wheat to Russia, because we trade with other countries that will trade with them. But let's don't give it to them. Looks to me like a good time to use a little leverage.

Farmer from Adams County:

I approve selling wheat to Russia for what they need, but do not think we should sell them enough to dole out to their satellites. I think we should get credit for helping feed those people. If Russia objects, those satellites will know who kept them from getting our wheat.

Farmer from McDonough County:

I would approve only if Russia used it for their own use and they pay their debt due the United States first.

Farmer from McDonough County:

I feel that if we don't sell it direct some other country will buy and divert to Russia. However, I have these reservations. In exchange for the deal we should have some consideration such as: Russians out of Cuba, a relief in Berlin, or some other concession of importance.

AD HOC COMMITTEES CIRCULARIZE CONGRESS ON BRACERO PROGRAM

(Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. HARSHA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of ad hoc committees with religious sounding names who are circularizing Congress with statements and resolutions in opposition to an extension of the bracero program.

Seldom do these committees or religious associations give their credentials or the basis of their views or valid reasons for their resolutions. A little investigation will reveal that they have made little or no objective study of the problems, many have never been near a farm—some only recently, after their commitment to oppose the bracero program—some did not and do not know the difference between a "wetback," a "green carder" or a bracero. Most have never lived near a migrant farm family or in a rural community. None has ever been a local governmental official. None has presented any alternative proposal.

The simple fact is that they do not know or understand the problem of the farmer or the bracero or the domestic.

If you want a religious answer to the bracero issue, consult your personal pas-

tor, priest, or rabbi. The clergy in areas where the bracero works and lives do not oppose the program. They have facts, experience, and knowledge, as well as compassion, theological training, and morality.

Naturally, all of us, proponents and opponents of the bracero bill, should be concerned with the pathetic plight of the migrant farmworker's family. The bracero program is an effective adjunct to a better life for domestic workers. It is the most satisfactory, humanitarian program yet devised to solve the social-economic supplemental farm labor problem.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CHILDREN

(Mr. FARBSTAIN (at the request of Mr. FUQUA) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of this body the meeting presently being held in Washington of more than 1,000 members of the National Association for Retarded Children. I am happy to say that my district in New York, the 19th Congressional District, is well represented at this distinguished convention.

The National Association for Retarded Children is a voluntary organization of national stature. It was founded in 1950 by a group of parents who were anxious to take action to improve life for their retarded children. From this small nucleus, the organization has grown constantly, until now more than 1,000 local associations exist across the 50 United States.

We have recently seen in this Congress enlightened legislation being passed to benefit the mentally retarded, legislation outlining plans for national action far beyond the dreams these people of NARC could even imagine when they formed their organization. Our country is finally taking positive action to help the children and adults who are retarded today, and to prevent mental retardation and ameliorate its tragic effects on the lives of children of coming generations.

The members of the National Association for Retarded Children are to be commended on the role they have played in leading action at the community level to help all of America's 5½ million retarded citizens. I should like to record a welcome to them to the Nation's Capital and wish them continued success in their endeavors.

THE DENIAL OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM OF JEWS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(Mr. FARBSTAIN (at the request of Mr. FUQUA) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, total annihilation threatens Soviet Judaism.

All the resources of the state are directed toward this purpose.

19228

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 24

Alone and isolated, unprotected by law, cut off from their religious confreres abroad, victimized by a ruthless and unmitigating propaganda assault, deprived of the sacred accoutrements of religious practice, the devout Soviet Jewish believer faces the greatest danger to his religious life, his sacred beliefs and traditions.

Discrimination against Soviet Jewry in general and the practice of the Jewish religion is a matter of official Soviet policy. A virulent press campaign, designed to distort the image of the Jew by resurrecting time-worn anti-Semitic stereotypes, is a grotesque manifestation of this policy. In the metropolitan and provincial press, especially in areas where most Soviet Jews reside and where anti-Semitism is still widespread and endemic, the Jews are portrayed as worshippers of money. Rabbis and lay leaders are always depicted as extortionists of money from devout Jews ostensibly for religious purposes, but in reality for their own selfish gain. Drunkenness is cited as a frequent problem in synagogue life. In general, Judaism is ridiculed; its religious rites mocked; and its tenets portrayed as potentially or actually subversive.

In addition to the propaganda assault on Judaism, the Soviet state employs even more direct methods of circumscribe the influence and effectiveness of Judaism. No central organization is permitted to unite congregations, facilitate communications, and in general to serve the spiritual needs of the Jewish religious community as a whole.

The state prohibits printing facilities for the Jewish community. Thus, there are no Jewish religious publications. No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917. A Russian translation of the Jewish version of the Old Testament has never been permitted. Nor has a Jewish religious book of any kind been published since the early 1920's, except for the recent publication of a siddur; that is, a Sabbath prayerbook. In 1958, an edition of only 3,000 copies of a prerevolutionary siddur was made available to the many thousands of practicing religious Jews. No prayerbooks for use on special religious occasions have been published, and Jews must rely on photographed copies of their religious calendars surreptitiously circulated among themselves.

Many other forms of religious discrimination obstruct the Soviet Jew in practicing his faith. A ban still exists on Hebrew so that Jews educated in the Soviet period cannot participate fully in the liturgy of Jewish religious observances. Indispensable accoutrements for the religious service such as the tallies and tefillin are prohibited. The public baking and sale of matzoth has been forbidden. Restrictions on building synagogues has reduced the number to some 60 or 70, and those few are expected to serve 1 million believers. Prior to 1957, Jews had no institutions to train rabbis, and the yeshiva established in 1957 as an adjunct of the great synagogue in Moscow has operated under great restrictions. In general, it could not hope to meet the demands that the service of a million practicing Jews would ordinarily require.

Jewish religious leaders have suffered direct personal attacks by Soviet authorities in a campaign of attrition and pressure on the Jewish community which has systematically increased since the middle of 1961. In June and July of 1961, synagogue presidents in six major provincial cities were deposed. Six lay religious leaders in Moscow and Leningrad were secretly arrested. In October 1961, the Moscow and Leningrad leaders were secretly tried on charges of alleged espionage and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. Soviet Jews are made to feel disloyal no matter how innocent their relations may be with Israel or nations of the West. In this regard it is important to note that the religious Soviet Jew is cut off completely from his confreres beyond the U.S.S.R. No Jewish religious delegation from the Soviet Union has ever been permitted to visit religious institutions abroad, and Soviet synagogues are not permitted to have any official contacts, permanent ties, or institutional relations with Jewish religious, congregational, or rabbinic bodies outside the Soviet Union.

All these acts against religious Soviet Jews and their practices add up to a systematic policy of attrition, designed to intimidate and atomize Soviet Jewry. This policy seeks to cut the bonds that link the Jew to his historic religious past, to isolate him within Soviet society and isolate him from the world community of Jewry, and in the end to destroy his Jewish spirit; for this policy aims not only at the Jewish religion but also at the whole of Jewish consciousness.

This policy is, therefore, not another program in the real sense—it has none of its spasmodic emotionalism; nor is it Hitlerian in its mode; it is rather a policy of gradualism, attrition, and atomization calculated to seek the same end: destruction of all those essential qualities and characteristics, both interior and exterior, that make the Jew a Jew.

I trust the world will take cognizance of the foregoing and that appropriate and necessary representations will be made to the Soviet Union to the end that recognition will be given to the plaint of the Jewish people of the repressions practiced against their coreligionists in the Soviet Union. Perhaps the Soviet Government will pay heed.

RECENT ACTION BY THE UNITED NATIONS ON ADMISSION OF RED CHINA INTO THE U.N.

(Mr. MORRIS (at the request of Mr. Fuqua) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is worth noting the recent action by the United Nations on the admission of Red China into the U.N. This was the 14th time that the proposal has been decisively rejected by the General Assembly. Again the United States took the lead in opposing such a move and I should like to call special attention to the statement made by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. representative to the United Nations, which points

out our position toward such a move in clear and concise terms:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN PLENARY, ON CHINESE REPRESENTATION, OCTOBER 16, 1963

Nothing has happened in the world in the past year to justify the General Assembly seriously redebating the item which we now have before us; indeed quite the opposite is the case. For many years this issue has been dealt with in decisive fashion by the United Nations; in 1961 proposals to seat the Communist Chinese and expel the Representatives of the Republic of China were defeated by a vote of 36 to 48; last year they were defeated by 42 to 56. In 1961 also the Assembly decided by a vote of 61 to 34 that any proposals to change the representation of China would come under the provisions of article 18(3) of the charter and this requires a two-thirds vote. Since then the leaders of Communist China have further demonstrated both in words and deed that they do not accept the most basic principles of the charter. The Albanian proposal is consequently totally inappropriate and should be decisively rejected.

Given the behavior of the Communist Chinese in the past year, it is even more unfortunate that the constructive mood of this 18th session of the General Assembly, a mood in which all, or almost all, of us have taken such satisfaction, should be interrupted in the strident and discordant rhetoric of the cold war. As President Kennedy said in his address at the outset of this session, the whole world is now looking to the United Nations to see if the current pause in the cold war can be stretched into a period of cooperation during which both sides can gain "new confidence and experience in concrete collaboration for peace." The Albanian proposal to expel one of our founding members and to replace its representatives with those of the world's most warlike regime is in essence a proposal to install the chilliest advocate of both cold and hot wars in our halls.

Two years ago on the eve of our debate on this subject Communist China had subjected Tibet to its domination. Last year it was engaged in aggressive warfare against India, and by its own admission was using its influence during the crisis over Soviet missiles in Cuba to try to prevent the solution which the rest of the world welcomed. And now this year we find Communist China not only embroiled in both old and new disputes, on all of its peripheries, but also being the unique and aggressive advocate, alone in the councils of the world, of the inevitability and desirability of war as a means of solving international disputes.

Mr. President, in the past 2 years 19 plenary meetings have been devoted to substantive debate on the representation of China. Nearly all members have expressed their views. In both 1961 and 1962, proposals to expel the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China and to admit Chinese Communist representatives were decisively rejected, not by less and less support, as claimed by the representative of Albania in his statement of September 27, but by a no vote of 48 in 1961 and by an absolute majority of 56 in 1962. One of the preceding speakers, furthermore, has based his case in part on the erroneous assumption that a majority of member states recognize Communist China. The fact is, of course, that an absolute majority of member states—namely 59—recognize the Government of the Republic of China.

The Albanian request that this Assembly reverse itself, that we throw out a loyal charter member and make room for representatives of a regime which is not a peace-loving state will not bear scrutiny.